

From: Linda Stantial
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:12 AM
Subject: June 2 vote on media industry regulation

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to request that on Monday, June 2, you vote against further de-regulation of the media industry that would allow greater consolidation and ownership of U.S. media organizations such as TV stations, newspapers, etc.

To maintain a health democracy, we need to assure that a wide diversity of views are expressed by the media available to all people in our country. We need the voice of small and large organizations, representing the full range of opinions held by U.S. citizens of all races, classes, ages, faiths, etc.

Freedom of speech is one of the most closely-held values in our nation. Do not take any action that grants control by a small handful of corporations or individuals over the expression of public opinion. Our media organizations are among the most important and powerful entities in our great country. Do not allow the media to abuse that power and negate the very freedom/diversity our founding fathers fought so diligently and intelligently to create!

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Linda Stantial of Weston, MA 02493

From: George Burrell
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:20 AM
Subject: FCC Rule Change

Ma'am,

One of the strengths of our sysyem is the diversity of views and opinions.Changing the rules as proposed would mute some of them.I urge you to oppose the rule change.

Thank You.

George M.Burrell,Fresno,Ca

From: Alan Newcomer
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:23 AM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership rules

Dear Ms. Abernathy:

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from the media monopolies. These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a health political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Alan Newcomer
Mt. Airy, Maryland 21771

From: Eileen MacDonald
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:26 AM
Subject: June 2nd vote

Dear Ms. Abernathy:

I am writing to urge you to delay your June 2nd vote on deregulating the media industry. As you know, many people in this country have expressed concern about monopolies destroying our right to balanced access to issues in the media. Our U.S. Senate has also requested that you postpone your decision and allow public input on this important issue. Please listen to our input and take the time to make a more thorough examination of the facts before your vote. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Eileen MacDonald
10475 Nadine
Huntington Woods, MI 48070

From: Leslie Lerner
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:26 AM
Subject: Media Consolidation

Allowing large corporations to corner the media markets will stifle small media outlets and threaten fair news reporting and eventually one of most cherished freedoms, free speech and a free press.

Leslie Lerner
1233 14th St.
Sarasota, FL 34236

From: jan robbins
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:28 AM
Subject: <No Subject>

I emplode you to postpone the vote planned in June, to expand the monology of the airwaves, until further study and public education/comment can be completed.

Sincerely,

Jan Robbins

janrobbins8@hotmail.com

From: David Schramm
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:30 AM
Subject: FCC Ownership Rules

I don't believe there has been sufficient exposure of the issues and understanding of the long term impact of permitting additional consolidation of media channels to a few large corporations. Because of the conflict of interest regarding this ruling in the major media corporations, the FCC should go the extra mile in making the public aware of your decision activity. Please delay your ruling and acquire public TV time to expose these new proposed rules so that you get an accurate reading of the US public. Just the fact that you might have to buy time with these corporations to gain proper coverage should itself be troubling.

Sincerely,

David A. Schramm

1615 Sunnyvale Avenue

Walnut Creek, CA 94597

From: Nancy Riley
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:35 AM
Subject: Proposed Change in Media Ownership Regulations

Honorable Commissioner Abernathy:

I have followed the news regarding the FCC's proposed change in ownership regulations concerning broadcast media ownership and I am deeply concerned that you have set a June 2 deadline for submitting new regulations on media ownership.

As a registered Republican voter, I can see that it might seem politically advantageous to enact new regulations to allow the consolidation of broadcast media prior to the 2004 election. However, I strongly believe that consolidation would severely impact the ability of the media to fairly inform the American public - under ownership of a few corporate conglomerates, the broadcast media would play an even greater role in the election than it already does. The message will be tainted by the money.

Further, I fear that media consolidation would bring America a media not seen since the days of William Randolph Hearst and his contemporaries, and would dramatically impact the average American's freedom of the press/media under the First Amendment.

Additionally, I believe a greater exposure of the media to conglomerates invites 'muscle' tactics and will result in high-profile RICO prosecutions. Why do you want America to relive the 20s and 30s?

I believe that media consolidation is a threat to the free flow of information and ideas, and it is wrong to issue new rules without giving the public an opportunity to review and discuss specific proposed regulations. An issue this important needs more debate and discussion.

Please, do not stifle debate on this issue. The American public served by the media must be allowed a chance to comment on this change that will directly affect their quality of life.

Nancy Riley
Notary Signing Agent
cell: 949-278-1733
res. 714-530-6096
fax: 714-530-9216
email: rileyabbott@earthlink.net

From: Tom Smith
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:36 AM
Subject: FCC rule change

Dear Commissioners,

I am absolutely opposed to the proposed weakening of FCC rules on station ownership. With all due respect, I hope you will not let this change occur.

Sincerely yours,

Tom Smith
37 Wallingford Rd
CHeshire CT 06410

From: melandlaurel
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:44 AM
Subject: Mr. Chairman, help me understand

Chairman Powell,

In anticipating with great interest your rule change meeting of 2 June, we want you, and the other commissioners, to help our family understand how, exactly, we will receive an equal or greater diversity of voices in the media involved with communication of news, educational information and entertainment and other "programming" by your allowing the further consolidation of media by removing regulations and limits on that ownership.

In helping me to understand that, it might be appropriate for you to first declare whether or not you believe that the current media climate is diverse enough (in terms of representing the view out among the citizenry), as well as whether or not you think that anyone can compete in that arena, as opposed to the arena being truly closed without an ability of a candidate to participation meeting a certain fiscal set of criteria.

In answerign these questions, and entering into a dialogue with at least this family, maybe we can begin to understand, exactly, how this will benefit the type of communication we are hoping for: that is, diverse, democratic, informative, in-depth, and overall based upon the promotion of citizenship and participatory democratic ideals including, but also going beyond, voting (i.e., media informative and entertaining content that allows citizens to know more about institutions and how they function -or not - with regard to the "greater good," instead of the reduction of "democracy" to "voting.").

We look forward to your response.

Warmly,

The Brennan Family
(Mel, Laurel, Mel IV, and Waverly)

Teaneck, NJ

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Gael Marshall Chaney
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:51 AM
Subject: Monday's vote

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

As a ordinary citizen with no financial interest in this matter, I urge you to vote against changing the rules about how many media outlets one company can own. The only way to keep diversity in the marketplace and make sure every viewpoint can be heard is to prohibit monopolies. The largest corporations are already bigger and more powerful than most governments on the planet. What's going to happen to our basic freedoms when they control all the media?

Thank you very much.

Gael Chaney

From: don hoch
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:53 AM
Subject: Don't ease ownership rules

Please do not ease the media ownership rules. This would promote consolidation which means that with fewer owners we would have less diversity of opinion. Donna Hoch Kansas City, MO

From: Raymond N. Jones
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, mcopps%fcc.govkjmweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:54 AM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Sirs and Madam,

I would like to voice my opinion on the proposed changes in Broadcast Ownership of Communications Corporations, and the ownership of Broadcasting Stations.

I am against the proposed changes to let corporations own and operate even more stations.

I think it would give the corporations too much power to sell their own points of view, while not allowing other points of view to be heard.

I would urge you to keep the same rules that have applied for a long time, and that have done a good job for a while.

Thanks for listening to my opinion,
Raymond N. Jones
Bentbeak@Juno.com
18971 Church St.
Marcellus, MI
49067

From: Jonathan Oaks
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:54 AM
Subject: TV ownership

Once again, we are bowing to the politically correct gods. Your rush to push forward with what appears to be an agenda against the families of this nation is ill-advised. To allow the TV giants to have full and absolute control over programming content is utter foolishness. TV is so full of idolatry, sexual content NOT suitable to a mixed audience, and money, money, money, that we need to continue local control by leaving TV stations in the hands of local affiliates and solely-owned stations.

I know my voice is small, and I don't have gobs of money to throw around, I can (easily) stop watching. I urge you to leave TV control where it currently resides, and that's with local owned stations, not corporate conglomerates that ONLY care about money. If you pass this agenda along, I'll see that what we really need to do is get rid of you, not the local stations.

Jonathan Oaks

Boca Raton FL

From: Lucy Crane and Don Smith
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:08 AM
Subject: Changes in FCC regulations

To the chairman and commissioners of the FCC:

I write to request in the strongest possible terms that you do not change the rules and policies concerning multiple ownership of stations. I want to have free access to the most varied new sources I can find, and living in a rural state with the potential for a very small number of owners to take command of all media outlets I worry quite a bit that what I get to read and hear has been filtered and edited by people who know little and care less about New Mexico

Please take the voices of the public into consideration as you make such an important decision.

Sincerely yours,

Donald W. Smith
3032 9th St NW
Albuquerque, NM 87107

From: bradford
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:10 AM
Subject: Do NOT Vote To Loosen The FCC Restrictions!!

I have heard it said that the old restrictions are not necessary in today's world with many more media outlets. Can you not see that all those media outlets are owned by the same corporations. They don't need any more help. The small companies trying to succeed in a market monopolized by the chains are the ones deserving of assistance. Do NOT vote to loosen the restrictions!

Bradford W. Harvey
Des Moines, IA

Monopoly or Democracy?
Op-ED
By Ted Turner
The Washington Post

On Monday the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is expected to adopt dramatic rule changes that will extend the market dominance of the five media corporations that control most of what Americans read, see and hear. I am a major shareholder in the largest of those five corporations, yet -- speaking only for myself, and not for AOL Time Warner -- I oppose these rules. They will stifle debate, inhibit new ideas and shut out smaller businesses trying to compete. If these rules had been in place in 1970, it would have been virtually impossible for me to start Turner Broadcasting or, 10 years later, to launch CNN.

The FCC will vote on several proposals, including raising the cap on how many TV stations can be owned by one corporation and allowing single corporations to own TV stations and newspapers in the same market.

If a young media entrepreneur were trying to get started today under these proposed rules, he or she wouldn't be able to buy a UHF station, as I did. They're all bought up. But even if someone did manage to buy a TV station, that wouldn't be enough. To compete, you have to have good programming and good distribution. Today both are owned by conglomerates that keep the best for themselves and leave the worst for you -- if they sell anything to you at all. It's hard to compete when your suppliers are owned by your competitors. We bought MGM, and we later sold Turner Broadcasting to Time Warner, because we had little choice. The big were getting bigger. The small were disappearing. We had to gain access to programming to survive.

Many other independent media companies were swallowed up for the same reason -- because they didn't have everything they needed under their own roof, and their competitors did. The climate after Monday's expected FCC decision will encourage even more consolidation and be even more inhospitable to smaller businesses.

Why should the country care? When you lose small businesses, you lose big ideas. People who own their own businesses are their own bosses. They are independent thinkers. They know they can't compete by imitating the big guys; they have to innovate. So they are less obsessed with earnings than they are with ideas. They're willing to take risks. When, on my initiative, Turner Communications (now Turner Broadcasting) bought its first TV station, which at the time was losing \$50,000 a month, my board strongly objected. When TBS bought its second station, which was in even worse shape than the first, our accountant quit in protest.

Large media corporations are far more profit-focused and risk-averse. They sometimes confuse short-term profits and long-term value. They kill local programming because it's expensive, and they push national programming because it's cheap -- even if it runs counter to local interests and community values. For a corporation to launch a new idea, you have to get the backing of executives who are obsessed with quarterly earnings and afraid of being fired for an idea that fails. They often prefer to sit on the sidelines.

waiting to buy the businesses or imitate the models of the risk-takers who succeed. (Two large media corporations turned down my invitation to invest in the launch of CNN.)

That's an understandable approach for a corporation -- but for a society, it's like overfishing the oceans. When the smaller businesses are gone, where will the new ideas come from? Nor does this trend bode well for new ideas in our democracy -- ideas that come only from diverse news and vigorous reporting. Under the new rules, there will be more consolidation and more news sharing. That means laying off reporters or, in other words, downsizing the workforce that helps us see our problems and makes us think about solutions. Even more troubling are the warning signs that large media corporations -- with massive market power -- could abuse that power by slanting news coverage in ways that serve their political or financial interests. There is always the danger that news organizations can push positive stories to gain friends in government, or unleash negative stories on artists, activists or politicians who cross them, or tell their audiences only the news that confirms entrenched views. But the danger is greater when there are no competitors to air the side of the story the corporation wants to ignore.

Naturally, corporations say they would never suppress speech. That may be true. But it's not their intentions that matter. It's their capabilities. The new FCC rules would give them more power to cut important ideas out of the public debate, and it's precisely that power that the rules should prevent. Some news organizations have tried to marginalize opponents of the war in Iraq, dismissing them as a fringe element. Pope John Paul II also opposed the war in Iraq. How narrow-minded have we made our public discussion if the opinion of the pope is considered outside the bounds of legitimate debate?

Our democracy needs a broader dialogue. As Justice Hugo Black wrote in a 1945 opinion: "The First Amendment rests on the assumption that the widest possible dissemination of information from diverse and antagonistic sources is essential to the welfare of the public." Safeguarding the welfare of the public cannot be the first concern of large publicly traded media companies. Their job is to seek profits. But if the government writes the rules in a certain way, companies will seek profits in a way that serves the public interest.

If, on Monday, the FCC decides to go the other way, that should not be the end of it. Powerful public groups across the political spectrum oppose these new rules and are angry about their lack of input in the process. People who can't make their voices heard in one arena often find ways to make them heard in others. Congress has the power to amend the rule changes. Members from both parties oppose the new rules. This isn't over.

The writer is founder of CNN and chairman of Turner Enterprises Inc.

From: Jim
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:12 AM
Subject: MM Docket No 01-317 and MB Docket No 02-277

NO NO NO! Please don't vote until ALL sides are heard! If you would, read 1984. You will see what this vote on Monday will do. Big Brother will be alive and well in Our Great Country if these proposed changes come into effect.

USA All The WAY,
Jim Hardin

Those who are willing to sacrifice essential liberties for a little order, will lose both and deserve neither.
- Benjamin Franklin

All Outgoing Mail
Has Been Scanned
Certified Virus Free
By Norton Antivirus
For a Free Virus Scan
Go to: www.sarc.com

From: Maureen Garelick
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:14 AM
Subject: Media consolidation

I know you're not listening, but it's my right to say it. Please don't undermine my ability to hear differing points of view. I've stopped listening to commercial radio in Denver because Clear Channel owns almost everything, and is so obviously reactionary it makes my hair stand on end and my skin crawl.

What are you afraid of? Bad publicity? You've already got that, and of course your rule change will minimize further avenues for diverse opinions to be heard. Open this up to genuine public comment and debate and make a decision that reflects the will and interests of everyone, not just your dad's boss and his cronies.

Maureen Garelick
Denver

From: John Varban
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:14 AM
Subject: Proposed Changes

We are AGAINST the FCC's proposed changes We believe it would limit our access for information and choices.
Mariet and John Varban

From: David Vassy
To: Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:15 AM
Subject: Please listen to people, not magnates: Do not further allow consolidation of media.

Dear Commissioners:

I urge you not to take the action you seem to be planning for Monday. Every media outlet that I've seen is reporting that you will vote in favor of further reducing diversity in communications. The current 35% market cap already allows far too much influence from too few over what we learn, and ultimately what we think. The number and diversity of organizations and individuals arrayed against your plans alone should show you that this plan is not the will of the majority of citizens. Yet the FCC seems to be forging ahead, holding over 70 meetings with industry interests, and only 5 with opposition groups.

Again, please do not increase media consolidation. It's bad news for thinking Americans--or is that the underlying motivation? OK, so George Orwell just missed the date a few years.

Thank you for your consideration.

David L. Vassy
Spartanburg, S.C.

CC: Jason L. Vassy

From: Debra Ireland
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:18 AM
Subject: ex-b'caster against dereg

Greetings:

I realize this e-mail arrives quite close to Monday's hearing and vote on matters regarding proposed further deregulation of the broadcast industry; however, I do hope that it is not too late for you to consider some of the points made herein.

I am a former broadcaster (radio and public relations for nearly twenty years) and current law student (third-year). I am making my mid-life career change for a variety of reasons. One of them is the current state of the broadcasting industry.

I have worked for small, independent stations with one owner, as well as for mid-sized chains (three to five stations) and giant media corporations (Clear Channel). I have worked both on-air as a morning show personality and newscaster (ten years) and also off-air, in production. I have worked in the northeastern U.S. (Pennsylvania) and also in the southwest (Texas). As a result of my varied experiences, I have come to the conclusion that deregulation has been very good for the BUSINESS of making money in broadcasting, and very bad for the broadcasting industry itself.

It is true that in this age of deregulation, the quality of the product offered on-air is more uniform from market to market across the country. However, uniformity is not necessarily good. Radio, especially, is not and should not be like McDonald's restaurants--the same everywhere you go. Yet that is the effect consolidation of ownership has had on the voice of individual communities. Projecting the personality and character of individual cities and towns has for the most part ceased, so that chains of stations can maximize economies of scale with voice tracking, syndication, and group "brand managers." Content is slicker, but more bland. (Perhaps they should be called "bland" managers).

Massive consolidation of ownership has also resulted, for lack of a better word, censorship of program content. What goes on the air, no matter how newsworthy or interesting, is often determined by how much money could be lost (or earned) by airing it. For example, these days it is not unusual to find a single news team providing information for up to six radio stations. Imagine now that airing a particular legitimate news item has been "discouraged" by management because it reflects poorly on a major client. (Yes, this DOES happen). Because of consolidated ownership, the resulting (offensive) editorial control is now intensified...affecting not one station, but six. As many as one-third to one-half of the stations in any given market can now be censored for financial reasons. It is possible because we have so few players now in this high-stakes industry. Further deregulation will make matters worse.

The control of news and/or information is further magnified when a single entity controls both radio and television stations in a given market, and uses them to excessively promote one another to the exclusion of other organizations not a favored arm of the corporate "family." Add internet, billboards, and newspapers to the mix. Now include promotion agencies, concert venues, ticket vendors, and in-house traffic services. Simply too much power and access is in the hands of a few money-driven decision makers. We are on the verge of allowing creation of a media monopoly that can not possibly be provide unbiased programming to the communities it "serves."

I do not disagree that broadcasters have a right to make money from their ownership ventures. However, making a profit should not simultaneously be detrimental to the public, the "true" owner of the frequencies broadcasters are licensed to care for and utilize. What happened to "in the public interest, convenience, and necessity," the mantra taught in college broadcasting ethics classes of the pre-deregulation era? It is not part of today's professional broadcasting vocabulary.

Because of media owners' urgent "need" to maximize profits and shareholder value, more attention is paid to "N.T.R." (non-traditional revenue generation) than programming. The industry is walking a very, very,

thin line between payola and promotion...between operating profitable ventures and incestuous control of the spectrum of broadcast frequencies and related industries. It is sad. It stifles creativity. And it is definitely not in the best interest of "community."

I write with passion for an industry that is changing, but not entirely for the better. My comments are not made because of nostalgia for the old days, or because of a resistance to change. (Actually, technological advances of the past decade have been marvelous, and have contributed greatly to a better-sound on-air.) Rather, I write because I truly believe more diversity in ownership in the industry generates a better product. There are too many ways for broadcasters to legally skirt the regulations that are already in place regarding ownership. More ways in which to do so should not be permitted.

Please reconsider your proposals to further de-regulate the industry.

Sincerely,
Debra Ireland
San Antonio, Texas

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kjmwebb@fcc.gov, jadelste@fcc.gov

From: Lawrence Galizio
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:30 AM
Subject: June 2, 2003

What do Mr. Murdoch's boots taste like anyway?

Lawrence A. Galizio
503.977.4274
galizio@hevanet.com
<http://spot.pcc.edu/~lgalizio>

From: Suzerkc@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:38 AM
Subject: Regulation Vote Monday

Suzanne Henley
2204 W. 49 Terrace
Westwood Hills, KS 66205

Dear Commissioner.

I am writing with great concern regarding the vote on Monday, June 2. I have never gone to this length to contact anyone regarding a government vote. I am very disturbed by the potential monopoly of information given to the American public should this vote pass. The basis of our country is to let an informed people govern themselves. We must put forth our greatest effort to keep the information given the people diversified and objective. Please do not allow these changes to occur.

Sincerely,
Suzanne Henley